



Holocaust inversion in British politics : the case of David Ward

KLAFF, Lesley

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/14589/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

KLAFF, Lesley (2016). Holocaust inversion in British politics : the case of David Ward. In: WISTRICH, Robert S., (ed.) Anti-Judaism, Antisemitism, and Delegitimizing Israel. Studies in Antisemitism Series . University of Nebraska Press, 185-196.

Repository use policy

Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in SHURA to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Holocaust Inversion in British Politics: The Case of David Ward

Lesley Klaff

INTRODUCTION

Antisemitism in Britain is no longer the preserve of the political far right as it was throughout much of the 20th century. It is more commonly found on the left of the political spectrum where it masks itself as anti-Zionism and uses the language of human rights in the “fight for Palestine.”¹ The 2006 All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism found that Holocaust inversion—the provocative comparison between the brutal and genocidal Nazi treatment of the Jews with the policies and practices of the Israeli state towards the Palestinians and the associated idea that “the Jews” should have learnt a moral lesson from the Holocaust—is commonplace among the British left and Palestine solidarity groups, particularly during periods of conflict in the Middle East.² Indeed, the portrayal of Israelis/Zionists/Jews as Nazis was a prominent feature of protests against the Iraq War, Operation Cast Lead, Operation Pillar of Defence, and most recently, Operation Protective Edge. In one month alone—July 2014—the Community Security Trust recorded 101 explicit references to the Holocaust, the majority of which were an attempt to equate Israel’s defensive actions in Gaza with the crimes of the Nazis.³

The current British vogue to account for the Israel-Palestinian conflict as a kind of Holocaust with the Israelis/Zionists/Jews portrayed as the “new” Nazis and the Palestinians portrayed as the “new” Jews is perhaps not surprising given the trope’s British provenance. While it is commonly assumed that Holocaust inversion originated in the Soviet polemics of the 1960s and 1970s, historian and antisemitism scholar Robert Wistrich has pointed out that the trope first emerged in the British Foreign Office as it sought to restrict survivors of the Holocaust from entering Palestine.⁴ Specifically, the Englishman Sir John Glubb Pasha, Supreme Commander of the Arab Jordanian Legion in Israel’s War of Independence, promulgated the idea that the Jews had anticipated Hitler’s master race theory.⁵ He claimed

that the young Jew of Palestine was “as hard, as narrow, as fanatical, and as bitter as the Hitler youth on whom he was modelled” and described Zionism as “a combination of Judaism and Nazism.”⁶ Other high-ranking officials in the Palestine administration, such as Lord Altrincham, claimed that the Zionist youth movements were a copy of the Hitler youth.⁷ Then in the 1950s, the famous British historian and passionate Arab protagonist, Arnold J. Toynbee, put the trope on an intellectual footing.⁸ He claimed in *A Study of History* that the Zionists were the disciples of the Nazis because they had “chosen to imitate some of the evil deeds that the Nazis had committed against the Jews.”⁹ He also claimed a moral equivalence between Israel’s attitude to the Arabs in 1947 and 1948 and the Holocaust.¹⁰ Although Toynbee’s account of the Jews has received wide condemnation as a historical text, his claim that Zionism is the avatar of Nazism has survived and even thrived in Britain.¹¹ The trope may even be said to have entered mainstream public opinion as early as the 1950s.¹²

It may not be surprising, then, that Holocaust inversion has recently been used by at least four members of Parliament, two from the Liberal Democrat Party and two from the Labour Party, to publicly execrate Israel.¹³ What is most disappointing, however, is the failure of the party leadership to discipline them for engaging in antisemitic discourse. After all, the 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into Antisemitism, which was an attempt to institutionalise a particular approach to the understanding of antisemitism,¹⁴ had recommended that the Government adopt the EUMC Working Definition of Anti-Semitism,¹⁵ which specifically lists the “Nazification” of Israel as a manifestation of contemporary antisemitism. Moreover, the 2009 Report of the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism, *Understanding the Nazi Card: Intervening Against Antisemitic Discourse* (The 2009 EISCA Report), which was funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government to examine the consequences of antisemitic discourse, reported that the “Nazification of Israel” has the potential to incite violence against British Jews and that “the Government and all the main parties are aware of the problem with the Nazi card.”¹⁶ Furthermore, the Jewish community in Britain complained to the party leaderships that statements which “Nazify” Israel were antisemitic.

I will focus here on one recent example of Holocaust inversion in the Liberal Democrat Party and the weak response from the party leadership in order to shed some light on why the public practice of Holocaust inversion by politicians is not treated as antisemitism and properly disciplined in Great Britain.

CASE STUDY

The affair involving the Liberal Democrat David Ward, MP for Bradford East, offers a classic case study. After signing the Book of Remembrance in the Houses of Parliament on Holocaust Memorial Day in 2013 he deployed Holocaust inversion in both its inversion of reality and of morality when he said:

Having visited Auschwitz twice, once with my family and once with local schools—I am saddened that the Jews, who suffered unbelievable levels of persecution during the Holocaust, could within a few years of liberation from the death camps, be inflicting atrocities on the Palestinians in the new state of Israel and continue to do so on a daily basis in the West Bank and Gaza.¹⁷

The offense to the Jewish community that Ward's Holocaust inversion caused was made worse by the fact that he made no distinction between Israel and "the Jews" and by the fact that he chose Holocaust Memorial Day—a day of national mourning for victims of the Shoah—to make his statement. Letters of complaint from the Jewish community poured in to Nick Clegg, Liberal Democrat Leader and Deputy Prime Minister in the Coalition Government. These letters pointed out that Ward's Israel—Jews—Nazi comparison was antisemitic and deeply offensive. They urged the Liberal Democrat Party to remove the party whip from Ward, which would have had the effect of either expelling him permanently or suspending him temporarily from the Party. Despite this, the Party Leadership took no action against him.

Then, amid the continuing furore, Ward caused further offense to the Jewish community when he insisted on the validity of his comparison. He said:

Because, don't forget, long before the death camps were set up, the treatment of the Jews in many of these European countries and of course following 1933, in particular in Nazi Germany, was racist, and directed at the Jewish people. It was very low level or what is regarded as low level cases and [sic] nastiness and harassment to begin with, and then escalated. And when you look at it—wherever it may be—the West Bank, and a declared intent by the Israeli forces to harass, often just annoy Palestinians—in terms of a check-point that will be open on certain days, and then it will be open but at a later time, and the next day, it will be open slightly earlier, so you get there and it's been shut again. . . really just to harass, in many cases to move the Palestinians from land, to just give up and move on. . . .¹⁸

It was only at this point that the Liberal Democrat Leadership reacted. Referring to Ward's original Israelis/Jews-Nazis statement, Liberal Democrat Leader and Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg said in the House of Commons, "I am unambiguous in my condemnation of anyone, from whatever party, including my own, who uses insensitive, intemperate, provocative, and offensive language."¹⁹ Ward was accordingly called to the House of Commons for a meeting with Deputy Prime Minister Clegg, the Liberal Democrat Party Deputy Leader, Simon Hughes, and the (then) Liberal Democrat Chief Whip, Alistair Carmichael.²⁰

While the rules of the Liberal Democrat Party Constitution allowed for Ward to be subjected to an internal investigation or to have his whip withdrawn at this point, the meeting was used merely to discuss Ward's need to comment on the Israel-Palestinian conflict using language that was both "precise" and "proportionate."²¹ I understand from conversations with members of the Liberal Democrat Friends of Israel that neither the issue of antisemitism nor the issue of discipline was raised at this meeting. The Liberal Democrat Leadership missed an important opportunity to publicly warn Ward about his use of antisemitic language, or if necessary, to help raise his awareness of the ways in which antisemitism can manifest itself in discourse, by engaging the Community Security Trust (CST) to work with him.

In fact, the emphasis on the need for him to be "precise" in his choice of language only seemed to feed Ward's antisemitic ways of thinking. This is evident from the statement he made immediately following the meeting:

There is a huge operation out there, a machine almost, which is designed to protect the State of Israel from criticism. And it comes into play very, very quickly and focuses intensely on anyone who's seen to criticise the State of Israel. And so I end up looking at what happened to me, whether I should use this word, whether I should use that word—and that is winning for them.²²

The Liberal Democrat Leadership's dismal failure to use that meeting to discipline Ward for his antisemitic comments meant that he was not restrained from making further antisemitic and otherwise offensive remarks. For instance, in November 2013 he tweeted, "[W]hat a shame there isn't a powerful well-funded Board of Deputies for #Roma," and in January 2014 he tweeted "[J]ust seen 'Twelve Years a Slave'—powerful—brutal inhumanity we still see today in places such as #Palestine."²³ In the same month he added: "[S]haron's death makes you think. The brutal, genocidal treatment of Jews must never be forgotten, but...the #Palestinians were not responsible."²⁴

As for the Liberal Democrat Leadership's emphasis on the need for "proportionality," this appears at first sight to be reasonable. There is a crude but implicit relationship between "proportionality" and "balance" suggesting that what was required of Ward was criticism of both sides in the Israel-Palestinian conflict. A good example of this can be seen in a letter written by Alistair Carmichael to David Ward in July 2013, where he states:

The Liberal Democrats have regularly and vocally expressed criticism of Israel's actions in the West Bank and Gaza, just as we have condemned terrorist attacks conducted against Israel. For instance, we have condemned Israeli settlement-building for making it even harder to reach a negotiated solution. Similarly we have condemned Hamas for allowing rocket attacks on Israeli civilians from the Gaza Strip.²⁵

But although conceptually reasonable, the problem with the "proportionality" requirement is that in practice it becomes unreasonable because of the likelihood of its misuse by those politicians who would demonise Israel. This is because of certain powerful trends in Britain today, which help shape the political agenda.

One powerful trend is to regard the "fight for Palestine" as an affirmation of progressive political values.²⁶ According to Anthony Julius, prominent lawyer and antisemitism scholar, this struggle has replaced the "fight for socialism" as a self-standing cause, unrelated to any larger project of human liberation, and even unrelated to any particular politics.²⁷ Every act and statement that is hostile to Israel is viewed in a positive light because the Israel-Palestinian conflict is regarded as inherently disproportionate and asymmetrical, with all the force and none of the justice on Israel's side and all the justice but none of the force on the Palestinian side.²⁸

Another powerful trend is to be found among many, but by no means all, British Muslims. The 2006 Parliamentary Report heard evidence that the Israel-Palestinian conflict has fuelled a sense of anger and injustice among many in the British Muslim community, creating a climate that is more hospitable to radical Islamist ideology, which calls for Israel's destruction.²⁹ For those sympathetic to this world-view, the Israel-Palestinian conflict is inherently disproportionate.

Several MPs either share these opinions themselves or are influenced by the fact that they serve large electorates that hold—or are assumed to hold—these views. Specifically, while some British Muslims may not have a strong view on the Israel-Palestinian conflict, it appears that MPs think they do and believe that the electoral impact of Gaza cannot be underestimated. For instance, during Operation Protective Edge, Conservative MPs fighting to hold marginal seats with significant Muslim populations were among those urging

David Cameron to issue an outright condemnation of Israel's actions in Gaza.³⁰ These political realities will necessarily impact on the "proportionality" requirement.

For example, Sir Bob Russell, Liberal Democrat MP for Colchester is a member of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, which advocates a one-state solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict. In July 2013 he used Holocaust inversion to criticise Israel when he asked the Education Secretary the following question during a debate on the national school curriculum in the House of Commons: "On the assumption that the 20th century will include the Holocaust, will he give me an assurance that the life of the Palestinians since 1948 will be given equal attention?"³¹ Yasmin Qureshi, Labour MP for Bolton South-East, is a British Muslim who serves a constituency with a large Muslim electorate. In February 2014 she used Holocaust inversion to criticise Israel when she said during a debate in the House of Commons on the Israel-Palestinian conflict:

Israel was founded because of what happened to the millions and millions of Jews who suffered genocide. It is quite strange that some of the people who are running the State of Israel seem to be quite complacent and happy to allow the same to happen in Gaza.³²

John Prescott, Labour Peer in the House of Lords and Deputy Prime Minister between 1997 and 2007, while no longer influenced by an electorate, has long been associated with the "fight for Palestine." In July 2014, during Operation Protective Edge, he wrote an Op Ed in the *Mirror* newspaper in which he compared the Gaza Strip to a "concentration camp" and fatuously added,

[W]hat happened to the Jewish people at the hands of the Nazis is appalling. But you would think that those atrocities would give Israelis a unique sense of perspective and empathy with victims of the ghetto.³³

The "proportionality" requirement is clearly not a restraint on Holocaust inversion by members of parliament.

As for David Ward, he was required by the Liberal Democrat Leadership to give an undertaking not to use Holocaust inversion again, and he complied. But the "proportionality" requirement did not prevent him from engaging in contemporary antisemitic discourse in other ways. Again, there were powerful trends at work here. Not only is David Ward an active member of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign but he serves a large Muslim electorate. In July 2013 he tweeted, "Am I wrong or am I right? At long last the #Zionists are losing the battle—how long can the #Apartheid state of Israel last?"³⁴ In

July 2014 during Operation Protective Edge he tweeted, “The big question is—if I lived in #Gaza would I fire a rocket?—probably yes.”³⁵ It is apparent that Ward learned nothing from the Liberal Democrat Party’s choice to respond to his Holocaust inversion by analysing it in terms of the need for language to be “precise” and “proportionate.” He did not even understand the meaning of the “precise” and “proportionate” requirement. Alistair Carmichael responded to Ward’s Apartheid state tweet by temporarily withdrawing his whip on the grounds that “questioning the continued existence of the State of Israel fails the test of language that is ‘proportionate and precise.’”³⁶ Similarly, the party’s current Chief Whip, Don Foster, found that Ward’s July 2014 Gaza rocket tweet was neither “precise” nor “proportionate” and asked him to ensure that all future comments would be difficult to misinterpret (that is, be “precise”) and condemn violence from both sides (that is, be “proportionate”).³⁷

One has to wonder why the Liberal Democrat Party did not treat Ward’s Holocaust inversion as a case of antisemitism and discipline him accordingly. There are several possible explanations. First, I was personally told by Alistair Carmichael in September 2013 that he had never heard of the EUMC Working Definition. I found this to be a disappointing admission of ignorance, given Carmichael’s senior role in the Coalition Government, the fact that he was (and is) a member of the Liberal Democrat Friends of Israel, and that he was charged with the responsibility of responding to Ward’s comments by considering whether or not to remove the Party whip from him. I subsequently e-mailed Carmichael a copy of the EUMC Definition, together with an explanatory note but received no acknowledgment. I can only assume that his failure to respond was caused, despite its purpose being made clear to him, by a disinterest in the definition. I also assume that Nick Clegg and Simon Hughes, even though more senior to Carmichael in the Party, are either similarly ignorant, or not prepared to be influenced by it.

Second, there is often deliberate obfuscation about what counts as antisemitism.³⁸ This is primarily because of the desire to distinguish hatred of Israel from antisemitism on account of the shame attached to anti-Jewish hostility.³⁹ This is one possible explanation for the Liberal Democrat Party’s choice not to view Ward’s Holocaust inversion as antisemitic. It is clear from a reply to my complaint about Ward from Nick Clegg’s office that the Liberal Democrat Party did not have any problem with Ward’s political position on Israel. They wanted to preserve for him and other Party members (some of whom support the Palestine Solidarity Campaign) the right to strongly criticise Israel without being labelled antisemitic. I quote from Clegg’s reply:

As the Chief Whip has been very careful to make clear, David was not censured for his political views on the Middle East, views that are shared by many in the Liberal Democrats. . . . It is perfectly right that politicians should be able to criticise the actions of a state in the strongest of terms.

Clegg added:

It is important to know that [David] was not asked—and would not be asked—to apologise for his political views on the situation in the Middle East.⁴⁰

Indeed, Clegg himself led the British criticism of Israel over Operation Protective Edge and pushed for a ban on arms exports to the Jewish State.

A more likely explanation, however, is that there was genuine confusion among the Liberal Democrat Leadership about whether Ward's Holocaust inversion was antisemitic rather than merely inappropriate. It is clear that the Party has a hard time recognising antisemitism. For instance, its response to Ward's November 2013 tweet "[W]hat a shame there isn't a powerful well-funded Board of Deputies for #Roma" was to dismiss it as flattering comment, despite its invocation of the Jews-have-acquired-great-power-for-financial-reasons trope,⁴¹ and Liberal Democrat Chief Whip Don Foster found that Ward's July 2014 tweet, "The big question is—if I lived in Gaza would I fire a rocket?—probably yes" was not motivated by antisemitism despite the fact that it appeared to endorse rocket attacks on Israeli civilians.⁴² This finding also shows a lack of awareness about the fact that language can be identified as antisemitic without the need to find intent or motivation on the part of the speaker. In fact, the Liberal Democrat Party is not alone in being unable to recognise antisemitism. Many people in Britain are uncertain as to what counts as antisemitism. This is because of an overwhelming ignorance of antisemitism's pre-Holocaust history and the fact that the Holocaust conditions popular understanding of antisemitism as state-sponsored genocide.⁴³ Even those who do acknowledge that antisemitism can manifest itself in contemporary polemics on the Israel-Palestinian conflict have difficulty recognising it because it is frequently driven by the anti-racist left and is masked by the language of human rights.⁴⁴ There is also no broad agreement as to where the line should be drawn between legitimate criticism of Israel and antisemitism.⁴⁵ This is why the 2006 Parliamentary Report had recommended that the government adopt the EUMC Definition, to provide some clarity on this point.

Another possible explanation is that the Liberal Democrat Party Leadership, like many people in Britain, does not regard Jews as being in

need of protection from racism. Jews are thought of as wealthy, privileged, and well-integrated into British society. In fact Anthony Julius notes that antisemitism faded from political consciousness in Britain in the 1970s precisely because of a sense that the Jews could look after themselves following Israel's victory in the Six-Day War.⁴⁶ At the same time anti-racists became concerned with the Far Right's hostile response to Afro-Caribbean and Asian immigration to Britain.⁴⁷ British anti-racists today are preoccupied with Islamophobia and anti-Roma racism to the exclusion of antisemitism.⁴⁸

So for whatever reason, the Liberal Democrat Leadership did not see, or did not choose to see, Ward's Holocaust inversion as antisemitic. But what about the fact that the Jewish community said it was antisemitic? Should this not have been enough for the Party Leadership to treat it as such and to discipline Ward accordingly? It is worth noting that the 2006 Parliamentary Report recommended that the test for antisemitism should be subjective. Citing the Macpherson Report's view that a racist act is defined by its victim, the Report said: "We conclude that it is the Jewish community itself that is best qualified to determine what does and does not constitute anti-Semitism."⁴⁹

There are three possible explanations as to why the Liberal Democrat Leadership did not listen to the Jewish community when it said that David Ward's Holocaust inversion was "antisemitic." First, according to sociologist Robert Fine, the British tendency to regard antisemitism as something that happened in the past means that people who claim they are victims of it in the present are regarded as either mistaken, over-sensitive, deluded, or worst of all—dishonest.⁵⁰ This is what David Ward himself thought. As well as accusing those who criticised his Holocaust inversion of acting dishonestly to prevent him from criticising Israel, he also accused those who criticised his July 2014 Gaza rocket tweet of a "jump straight on the anti-Semitism bandwagon."⁵¹ Second, Fine also believes that those who raise concerns about contemporary antisemitism in Britain are regarded as inherently conservative and reactionary and they are ignored for this reason. It is as if the supporters of Israel and the "purveyors of antisemitism" are regarded as the enemy of all universal principles. This draws on an old tradition of anti-Jewish stereotyping which regards Jews as the "particularised people par excellence."⁵² Third, there is a long tradition in British antisemitism that the Jew may be wounded with impunity and treated with contempt.⁵³ This traditional British attitude to Jews may have informed a subconscious indifference to Jewish complaints of antisemitism among the Liberal Democrat Leadership.

CONCLUSION

It is important for all British political parties to be intolerant of Holocaust inversion. Equating Israel with Nazi Germany trivialises the Holocaust and amounts to what Deborah Lipstadt has called “soft-core denial.”⁵⁴ It also creates a climate in which British Jews feel demoralised at best, and suffer fear and intimidation at worst. Politicians are influential and they have a duty to use language responsibly. While it is legitimate for politicians to make considered criticisms of Israel and the Palestinians, it is not legitimate for them to defame Israel by equating her with Nazi Germany or to misuse the Holocaust to morally indict Jews. The fact that the Liberal Democrat Party did not act strongly enough in the case of David Ward is a matter of concern. His statement should have been treated as antisemitism, and he should have been disciplined accordingly.

NOTES

1. Anthony Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 450–55.
2. Manfred Gerstenfeld, “Holocaust Inversion: The Portraying of Israelis and Jews as Nazis,” *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*, no. 55, 1 Apr. 2007. Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism 2006, p. 34, para 169, <http://www.antisemitism.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/All-Party-Parliamentary-Inquiry-into-Antisemitism-REPORT.pdf> (accessed 24 Apr. 2014).
3. Michael Gove, “We need action—now more than ever,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 Sept. 2014, 52. For an overview of the reasons for the use of Holocaust inversion as a means to criticise Israel, see Lesley Klaff, “Political and Legal Judgment: Misuses of the Holocaust in the UK,” *International Journal of the Social Research Foundation* 1 (2) (July–Dec. 2013): 1, 3–9; and for a theoretical explanation of the reasons for Holocaust inversion, see David Seymour, “From Auschwitz to Gaza: Ethics for the Want of Law” *Journal of Global Ethics* 6 (2) (2010): 205.
4. Winston Pickett, “Lenin’s legacy—why Jews have been betrayed by the radical Left,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 June 2012, <http://www.thejc.com/lifestyle-features/69409/lenins-legacy-why-jews-have-been-betrayed-radical-left> (accessed 23 Apr. 2014). This refutes the received view that Britain “gave” the Jews Israel out of some sort of Holocaust “guilt.”
5. Manfred Gerstenfeld, “Antisemitism Embedded in British Culture: An Interview with Robert Solomon Wistrich,” *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism* 70 (1 July 2008).
6. Robert S. Wistrich, “Anti-Semitism in Britain has gone main stream,” *Cruel Britannia: Azureonline*, <http://azure.org.il/include/print.php?id=173> (accessed 23 Apr. 2014).
7. Manfred Gerstenfeld, “Antisemitism Embedded.”
8. Robert S. Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession: Antisemitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (New York: Random House, 2010), 377–80.

9. Ibid.
10. "The Herzog-Toynbee Debate," in *A People that Dwells Alone*, edited by Yaacov Herzog (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975), 21–47.
11. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 414.
12. Winston Pickett, "Lenin's legacy," 5. Indeed, Holocaust inversion is but a variant of the "persecuted Jews become the persecutors" trope, popularised by the Bishop of Norwich in 12th-century England; see Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 510.
13. The Liberal Democrat Party is not regarded as a left-wing party. It is an amalgam of old-style liberals who oppose excessive government regulation, and new-style liberals who favor state intervention.
14. David Hirsh, "Hostility to Israel and Antisemitism: Toward a Sociological Approach," *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* 5, no. 1 (June 2013): 23.
15. Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into Antisemitism (2006) (henceforth, 2006 Parliamentary Report), 5, par. 26.
16. Paul Iganski and Abe Sweiry, *Understanding the "Nazi Card": Intervening against Antisemitic Discourse*, Report of the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism, July 2009, <http://www.eisca.eu/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/nazicard.pdf> (accessed 1 Mar. 2013).
17. Ben Quinn, "Lib Dem MP David Ward defends remarks about Israel," *The Guardian*, 25 Jan. 2013, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2013/Jan/25/lib-dem-david-ward> (accessed 13 Feb. 2013).
18. Ibid.
19. BBC News Politics: "David Ward summoned by Clegg after 'Jews' comments," 13 Feb. 2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-21446292> (accessed 23 Feb. 2013).
20. Ibid.
21. "David Ward has party whip withdrawn over 'Jews' comment," <http://www.libdemvoice.org/david-ward-has-party-whip-withdrawn-over-Jews-comment-35379.html> (accessed 24 Apr. 2014).
22. BBC News Politics, "David Ward summoned." The charge that those raising concerns about contemporary antisemitism are acting in bad faith to deflect criticism of Israel is itself antisemitic and has been called by some the "Livingstone Formulation"; see David Hirsh, "Accusations of malicious intent in debates about the Palestine-Israel conflict and about antisemitism: The Livingstone Formulation, 'playing the antisemitism card' and contesting the boundaries of antiracist discourse," *Transversal* (Graz, Austria) 1 (Jan. 2010): 47–77. This denial of contemporary antisemitism is commonplace in Britain.
23. Sarah Ann Brown, "David Ward: Still harping on Israel," *Harry's Place*, <http://hurryupharry.org/2014/01/19david-ward-still-harping-on-israel> (accessed 23 Apr. 2014).
24. "British Lawmaker David Ward Angers Jews with Ariel Sharon Death Tweet," *Jewish Daily Forward*, 20 Jan. 2014, <http://forward.com/articles/191242/british-lawmaker-david-ward-angers-jews-with-ariel/> (accessed 23 Apr. 2014).
25. Alistair Carmichael to David Ward, 17 July 2013.
26. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 450–55.
27. Ibid., 455.
28. Ibid.

29. 2006 Parliamentary Report, 26., para. 127.
30. Francis Elliot, "Tories can afford to ignore Muslim vote," *The Times*, 6 Aug. 2014.
31. Matthew Harris, "Sir Bob Russell's Question on the Holocaust," *The Commentator*, http://www.thecommentator.com/article/3958/sir_bob_russell_s_question_on_the_holocaust (accessed 22 Apr. 2014).
32. Marcus Dysch, "Labour MP Condemned for Gaza-Holocaust Comparison," *Jewish Chronicle*, 7 Feb. 2014, www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/115471/labour-mp-condemned-gaza-holocaust-comparison (accessed 14 Feb. 2014).
33. Daniel Martin, "Lord Prescott accused of 'trivialising the Holocaust' after comparing the Gaza Strip to a concentration camp and a ghetto," www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2711447/John-Prescott-accused-trivialising-Holocaust-comparing-Gaza-Strip-concentrationcamp.html (accessed 1 Sept. 2014).
34. Alistair Carmichael to David Ward, 17 July 2013
35. Marcus Dysch, "Lib Dems Won't Act Over Ward Tweet," *Jewish Chronicle*, 15 Aug. 2014, p. 5.
36. Alistair Carmichael to David Ward, 17 July 2013
37. Georgia Graham, "Liberal Democrat MP censured for saying he would fire a rocket at Israelis is cleared by his party," *Telegraph*, 13 Aug. 2014, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/libdemMP-censured-for-saying-he-would-fire-a-rocket-at-israelis-is-cleared-by-his-party.html> (accessed 24 Aug. 2014).
38. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, p. xlv.
39. *Ibid.*
40. Nick Clegg to author, email, 1 Feb. 2013.
41. Daniel Finkelstein, "Dear Nick, from Daniel...", *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 Nov. 2013, p. 30.
42. Dysch, "Lib Dems Won't Act Over Ward Tweet."
43. Robert Fine, "Fighting with Phantoms: a contribution to the debate on antisemitism in Europe," *Patterns of Prejudice* 43, no. 5 (2009); David M. Seymour, *Critical Theory: the Holocaust, Human Rights and Antisemitism*, paper presented at the Harvard Law School Critical Legal Theory Conference, March 2013.
44. 2006 Parliamentary Report, 32, par. 158.
45. *Ibid.*, 4, par. 21.
46. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 517.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Robert Fine, "On doing the sociology of antisemitism," *European Sociological Association Newsletter* 33 (Winter 2012): 5.
49. 2006 Parliamentary Report, p. 1. par. 3.
50. Fine, "On doing the sociology of antisemitism," 2.
51. Georgia Graham, "Liberal Democrat MP censured."
52. Fine, "On doing the sociology of antisemitism," 4.
53. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 191.
54. Jonny Paul, "Holocaust Scholar Warns of New 'Soft-Core' Denial," *Jerusalem Post*, 6 Feb. 2007.